



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,756	07/24/2003	Kevin Traynor	032674-200	1739
7590	08/11/2005			EXAMINER
Burns, Doane, Swecker & Mathis, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			KING, JUSTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/626,756	TRAYNOR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Justin I. King	2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/4/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prenn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,734,984).

Referring to claim 14: Prenn discloses that for each interrupt input, a plurality of AND gates (figure 6, AND gates in structure 601) each corresponding to an interrupt source, a plurality of control bits (figure 6, signals AEQ, BEQ, CEQ, and DEQ) each corresponding to an interrupt source and providing a control bit to the corresponding logical AND gate, and logical OR gate (figure 6, OR gate in structure 603). Hence, claim 14 is anticipated by Prenn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Suh (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,065) and Prenn.

Referring to claim 1: Suh discloses an interrupt controller and a method of accessing interrupts. Suh discloses mapping each of the plurality of interrupt sources to each of the plurality of interrupt inputs (figure 3, connections between structures 30 and 40, and between structures 30 and 50). Suh discloses control logic (figure 1, structure 90) to enable and to disable the interrupt controller, but Suh does not explicitly discloses selectively enabling interrupt requests from each of the plurality of interrupt sources to one or more of the plurality of interrupt inputs.

Prenn discloses an interrupt handling circuit. Prenn discloses a “PARTICIPATE” signal to selectively enable or to selectively disable the associated interrupt signal (figure 6, signals go into structure 601, column 8, last paragraph, and column 9, lines 1-8); Prenn’s “PARTICIPATE” signals are the control bits. Each of Prenn’s “PARTICIPATE” signals attaches to the AND gate between each of the plurality of interrupt sources and one of the interrupt inputs. Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting over each interrupt source and a system design with expandability, less added complexity, and less added propagation delay (column 2, lines 50-52, and column 9, line 12).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adopt Prenn's teaching onto Suh at the time Applicant made the invention because Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting over each interrupt source and a system design with expandability, less added complexity, and less added propagation delay.

Referring to claim 2: Prenn generates the "PARTICIPATE" signals via a comparator (figure 2, structure 248); the comparator's comparing operation is the claimed determining a value of control bits respectively associated with each mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination. Prenn discloses that only selected number of item generators of array (figure 2, structure 202) will output signals based on the "PARTICIPATE" signal (column 8, lines 60-67), which is the claimed selectively enabling interrupt requests between the mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination according to the respective control bit values.

Referring to claim 3: Prenn generates the "PARTICIPATE" signals via a comparator (figure 2, structure 248); the comparator's comparing operation is the claimed determining a value of control bits respectively associated with each mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination. Prenn discloses that only selected number of item generators of array (figure 2, structure 202) will output signals based on the "PARTICIPATE" signal (column 8, lines 60-67), which is the claimed selectively enabling interrupt requests between the mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination according to the respective control bit values. Furthermore, each of Prenn's interrupt request processing blocks (figure 2, structures 224, 226, and 228) has a comparator for generating "PARTICIPATE" signal; thus Prenn discloses repeating the steps of determining value for each combination and selectively enabling interrupt requests until every interrupt source/interrupt input combination is handled.

Referring to claim 6: Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting (column 9, line 12), which is the claimed defining control bit values according to the system requirement.

Referring to claim 7: Suh discloses an interrupt controller and a method of accessing interrupts. Suh discloses mapping each of the plurality of interrupt sources to each of the plurality of interrupt inputs (figure 3, connections between structures 30 and 40, and between structures 30 and 50). Suh discloses control logic (figure 1, structure 90) to enable and to disable the interrupt controller, but Suh does not explicitly discloses selectively enabling interrupt requests from each of the plurality of interrupt sources to one or more of the plurality of interrupt inputs.

Prenn discloses an interrupt handling circuit. Prenn discloses a “PARTICIPATE” signal to selectively enable or to selectively disable the associated interrupt signal (figure 6, signals go into structure 601, column 8, last paragraph, and column 9, lines 1-8); Prenn’s “PARTICIPATE” signals are the control bits. Each of Prenn’s “PARTICIPATE” signals attaches to the AND gate between each of the plurality of interrupt sources and one of the interrupt inputs. Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting over each interrupt source and a system design with expandability, less added complexity, and less added propagation delay (column 2, lines 50-52, and column 9, line 12).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adopt Prenn’s teaching onto Suh at the time Applicant made the invention because Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting over each interrupt source and a system design with expandability, less added complexity, and less added propagation delay.

Referring to claim 8: Prenn generates the “PARTICIPATE” signals via a comparator (figure 2, structure 248); the comparator’s comparing operation is the claimed determining a value of control bits respectively associated with each mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination. Prenn discloses that only selected number of item generators of array (figure 2, structure 202) will output signals based on the “PARTICIPATE” signal (column 8, lines 60-67), which is the claimed selectively enabling interrupt requests between the mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination according to the respective control bit values.

Referring to claim 9: Prenn generates the “PARTICIPATE” signals via a comparator (figure 2, structure 248); the comparator’s comparing operation is the claimed determining a value of control bits respectively associated with each mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination. Prenn discloses that only selected number of item generators of array (figure 2, structure 202) will output signals based on the “PARTICIPATE” signal (column 8, lines 60-67), which is the claimed selectively enabling interrupt requests between the mapped interrupt source/interrupt input combination according to the respective control bit values. Furthermore, each of Prenn’s interrupt request processing blocks (figure 2, structures 224, 226, and 228) has a comparator for generating “PARTICIPATE” signal; thus Prenn discloses repeating the steps of determining value for each combination and selectively enabling interrupt requests until every interrupt source/interrupt input combination is handled.

Referring to claim 12: Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting (column 9, line 12), which is the claimed defining control bit values according to the system requirement.

Referring to claim 13: Prenn discloses the AND gates (figure 6, AND gates in structure 601).

4. Claims 4-5 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Suh, Prenn, and Monahan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,001,783).

Referring to claims 4 and 10: Suh and Prenn's disclosures are stated above; neither of them explicitly discloses setting the control bit values according to user preference. Monahan discloses a priority interrupt mechanism, and Monahan discloses a programmable interface application to configure interrupt related information, such as the priority (column 3, lines 10-14). Monahan teaches one to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adopt Monahan's teaching onto Suh and Prenn because Monahan teaches one to implement a system with flexibility allowing user to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source.

Referring to claims 5 and 11: Monahan discloses a programmable interface application for interrupt configuration, which configures the system while system is in operation. Thus, Monahan discloses dynamically modifying according to user preference.

5. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Prenn, and Monahan.

Referring to claim 15: Prenn's disclosure is stated above; Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting for the interrupt (column 9, line 12), but Prenn does not explicitly

disclose the implementation for the interrupt priority setting, or any storage means or registers for storing priority setting/control bit values; thus, one with ordinary skill in the computer art, who would like to implement the interrupt priority setting, would look for the teachings of implementing the priority setting.

Monahan discloses a priority interrupt mechanism, and Monahan discloses a programmable interface application to configure interrupt related information, such as the priority, and the setting information is stored in each module's storing means (column 3, lines 10-14). Monahan teaches one to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adopt Monahan's teaching onto Prenn because Monahan teaches one to implement a system with flexibility allowing user to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source.

Referring to claim 16: Prenn's disclosure is stated above; Prenn does not explicitly disclose setting the control bit values according to user preference, but Prenn teaches one to implement an interrupt system with priority setting (column 9, line 12). Monahan discloses a priority interrupt mechanism, and Monahan discloses a programmable interface application to configure interrupt related information, such as the priority (column 3, lines 10-14). Monahan teaches one to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source. Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adopt Monahan's teaching onto Prenn because Monahan teaches one to implement a system with flexibility allowing user to further adjust the system performance by customize priority for each interrupt request source.

Referring to claim 17: Monahan discloses a programmable interface application for interrupt configuration, which configures the system while system is in operation. Thus, Monahan discloses dynamically modifying according to user preference.

Referring to claim 18: Prenn teaches one to implement a system with priority setting (column 9, line 12), which is the claimed defining control bit values according to the system requirement.

Referring to claim 19: Prenn discloses that the processor is a part of a microcontroller unit (figure 1).

Referring to claim 20: Prenn discloses that the number of interrupt sources is greater than the number of interrupt inputs (figure 6).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin I. King whose telephone number is 571-272-3628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632 or on the central telephone number, (571) 272-2100. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will cease to be mailed to applicants with Office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of foreign patents and non-patent literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. patent or patent application publications will not be granted.



TIM VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Justin King
August 6, 2005